



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of our era in any aspect of their influence. So that there should be a wide welcome for the English translation of Friedländer's *Sitten-geschichte*.

T. R. GLOVER.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE,  
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

THE EARLY CHURCH IN THE LIGHT OF THE MONUMENTS. A. S. BARNES, M.A. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1913. Pp. xx, 223. \$1.50.

It is a good book that Mgr. Barnes has written. Although it appears in "a series of manuals for Catholic priests and students" (entitled *The Westminster Library*), it is worthy of a much broader circle of readers. Not only is it evident that the author is intent upon discovering the truth and telling it, but his work is marked by real candor and critical discrimination. To say that the book reports only the most familiar common-places of Christian archaeology is by no means to disparage it. That is what it is for, and it fulfils its purpose very well. I know no other book which would serve so well to provide the cultured reader with a brief and readable orientation in the field of Christian archaeology. Mgr. Barnes is known chiefly by his learned and sumptuous monograph, *St. Peter's in Rome*. Were he not well acquainted with the whole field of Christian archaeology, he would not have been able to do this simple work so well.

The monuments *do* cast "light" upon the history of the Early Church; but the written history of the Church casts still more light upon the monuments, which would be dark indeed without this illumination. It is not unreasonable, therefore, that the author in the first part of his book, *The Growth of the Church in the First Three Centuries*, depends chiefly upon written records. He has selected topics which receive new emphasis and illumination from the study of the monuments. The titles of the chapters are: I. The Apostles at Rome; II. The Earliest Converts; III. The Blood of the Martyrs; IV. The Collegia and the Catacombs; V. The Christianizing of Rome.

Part II. treats of "The Witness of the Monuments to Christian Dogma." It must always be remembered that the written word is the only adequate expression of the dogma of times gone by. Without it the pictorial symbolism of the early Church would be unintelligible. The "monuments" serve chiefly to reveal the popular prevalence of a dogma otherwise well known, or they may point more precisely to the age in which it first became popular. What

one first wants to know, therefore, is the *date* of the monument in question. That consideration the author has generally left out of account. He contents himself with proof of the prevalence of the dogma *some* time before the fifth century. He deals frequently with controverted points, where the point of the controversy lies in the answer to the question, How early? One cannot find fault with the author for devoting one chapter to "The Witness of the Monuments to the Primacy of the Holy See." The monuments *do* bear witness to the primacy of Peter (which is at least as plainly set forth in the Gospels), and to the claim of the Bishop of Rome to a similar primacy. But the unanswered question is, How early? And is it not a far cry from Damasus to Hildebrand?

I must challenge the author sharply on one point, though I agree with him even there in substance. He says: "There is always a further distinction by which St. Peter is given a rank superior to his brother Apostle [Paul]. It is not merely that he is on the right hand of our Lord while St. Paul is on the left. To that rule there are several exceptions." Now the fact is that in the monuments of the fourth and fifth centuries, whenever the two Apostles are depicted on either side of our Lord, it is St. Paul that is on the right and St. Peter that is on the left, and to this rule there are few exceptions. It is not only on the sarcophagi and other sepulchral monuments that we have the Apostles in this position, but also, more solemnly and emphatically, in the great mosaics of the basilicas. It is vain to affirm that "the question [of the relative dignity of the right and left] was finally decided in favor of the dexter side only by the rise of the science of chivalry." For this is a distinction of immemorial observance; it was familiar to the Jews, and it is strikingly employed in the Gospel. The mere fact that the early artists placed St. Paul almost invariably on the right shows that they followed a rule and recognized the distinction. In the ancient mosaic which decorates the triumphal arch of St. Paul's in Rome the Apostle to the Gentiles occupies as usual the post on the right of Christ. Immediately below this arch two modern statues represent the Apostles in the reverse order—St. Peter is on the right. Mgr. Barnes proceeds: "The mark which most frequently distinguishes St. Peter in the earliest representations [they are none of them anterior to the fourth century] is that our Lord is depicted in the act of handing to him a roll or a volume, an act which is sometimes explained by the accompanying inscription, DOMINUS LEGEM DAT." I am disposed to think that St. Peter receives the roll simply because he is on the left. The Lord's right

hand being engaged in the gesture of instruction or benediction, it is only with his left he can hold the roll of the "new law." Thus the monuments, far from affording a salient proof of Peter's primacy, actually *seem* to contradict it. I say "seem," for there is no doubt that the Roman Church in the fourth century attached great importance to the primacy of Peter. The fact that in the official art of the Church Paul appears in the place of honor is an enigma. I seek to explain it by the consideration that Paul represents "the Church from among the Gentiles," Peter, "the Church from among the Circumcision." Such are the inscriptions we find attached to two symbolical female figures in the Church of Sta. Sabina, and the Gentile Church is on the right. In the apsidal mosaic of the Title of Pudens similar figures (though without any inscription) are depicted behind Peter and Paul, and again it is the Gentile Church which has the place of honor. Originally, no doubt, Jerusalem and Bethlehem were depicted in the lower part of this mosaic, as they were in so many other places, and Bethlehem must have been as usual on the right, as symbolizing the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles (through the Magi). History had accorded the place of honor to the Gentile Church; the Church of the Circumcision was no more than a reminiscence. The Church of Rome was conscious of its Gentile character and proud of it. My notion is that this is the feeling which placed Paul, in solidarity with Bethlehem and the personification of the Gentile Church, on the right hand of Christ. It may have been thought that the honor of receiving the law made up to Peter in some measure for the position of inferiority into which he was forced.

"The Witness of the Monuments with regard to Holy Baptism" is the author's next topic. It must be confessed that the witness with regard to the age and form of baptism is meager and ambiguous. Here it would have been very much to the point to date the monuments. The claim that infant baptism and baptism by affusion were practices of the earliest Church is a claim which has more truth than evidence on its side, to use an expression of Jeremy Taylor's. There is more interest in "The Witness of the Monuments to the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist." But again it must be remembered that pictorial symbols can never define dogma so sharply as do words. If one holds the dogma of transubstantiation, it is natural enough to see it expressed in the fish as it is used for a symbol of the Eucharist. But does it really express that precise dogma more clearly than any other dogma which acknowledges a real though spiritual participation in Christ?

In no case is a sense of perspective (implying an accurate dating of the monuments) more necessary than in "The Witness of the Monuments to the Communion of Saints," *i.e.* to the practice of prayer for the dead and to the dead. The fact that there is nothing of the sort here may perhaps be excused by the popular character of the book. But between the simple inscription, *VIBAS IN PACE ET PETE PRO NOBIS*—an unreflective cry of the heart—and the medieval doctrine and practice which absorbed the greater part of men's piety and constituted the keystone of ecclesiastical finance ("high" as well as "low"), there lies a long history and a great transformation.

In the concluding chapter of this part the author writes about the supposed portraits of Christ, the Virgin, and the Apostles, with more discrimination than do some Protestants.

In the third part—"The Development of Church Buildings"—the author is in his own special field, and permits himself to elaborate in some detail certain personal observations and theories. He has interesting observations to make about the form of the Constantinian churches in Rome and the transformations they underwent. He justly opines that these great churches, together with those in Jerusalem and Constantinople, fixed the traditions of Church architecture. He has interesting remarks to make about the orientation of the churches, but it does not seem to me that he has come near to solving the problem. It used to be the fashion for archaeologists to endeavor to explain why one or another church in Rome has its portal facing east and its altar at the west end. Some practical reason could generally be adduced to explain such a breach of the "rule." It was tardily recognized that the *rule* in Rome—the invariable rule during the first half of the fourth century—was to place the altar at the west end. This the author rightly recognizes. But he falls into error when he asserts that this was peculiar to Rome. It was characteristic, so far as I know, of *all* the churches which Constantine built, whether at Rome, at Jerusalem, at Bethlehem, at Tyre, or at Constantinople. That observation casts a dim ray of light upon this obscure subject. Constantine apparently had a fancy for opening the door of the church towards the rising sun. He stubbornly confused sun-worship with Christianity. It is by no means clear to me why the generation which immediately followed him resolutely turned their churches the other way.

WALTER LOWRIE.

ROME, ITALY.